

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-35 will remain pending in this application. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added by the present amendment. Claims 14, 17-19, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. PG-Publication No. 2003/0069902 (“Narang”). Claims 1, 12, 13, 24 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. PG-Publication No. 2003/0069902 (“Nojima”) in view of Narang. Claims 2 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Nojima in view of Narang and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,035,874 (“Reed”). Claims 3-5, 7-11, 26-28 and 30-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Nojima in view of Narang and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,870,758 (“Bramford”). Claims 6 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Nojima in view of Narang and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,626 (“Ponnekanti”). Claims 15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Narang in view of Reed. Claims 16 and 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Narang in view of Bramford. Applicants respectfully traverse all outstanding rejections.

***Interview Summary***

Applicants’ undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Dennis Vautrot participated in a telephonic interview on October 10, 2006 to discuss the preceding claim amendments. Examiner Vautrot agreed to reconsider the rejections in light of these amendments.

***Specification***

The Specification is hereby amended to correct a number of clerical errors present in the originally filed application.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)***

Claims 14, 17-19, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. PG-Publication No. 2003/0069902 (“Narang”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claims 14 and 19 recite that, in response to receiving a file system statement, it is determined if a read (claim 14) or write (claim 19) lock is available for a corresponding row of a data table.

Narang (¶ 0021) discloses that an application can request permission to access a picture file from a database management system (DBMS). To process this request, the DBMS determines whether or not the application has permission to access a table that includes a picture column. If the DBMS determines that the application has permission to access the table, then the DBMS grants access permission to the application and returns an authorization token to the application along with the file name of the picture. The application then issues a file open request (*e.g.*, a file system statement) for the picture. The application submits the authorization token as part of the file open request. If the authorization token is successfully validated, then the file open request is accepted.

Thus, in Narang, the application must first acquire DBMS permission to access a picture file prior to issuing a file system statement to open the picture file. Accordingly, Narang cannot possibly teach or suggest determining whether read or write access is available “in response to receiving the file system statement,” as required by independent claims 14 and 19. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 14 and 19 are not anticipated by Narang. Applicants further submit that claims 17, 18, 22 and 23 are patentable at least be reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 1, 12, 13, 24 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. PG-Publication No. 2003/0069902 (“Nojima”) in view of Narang.

Independent claims 1 and 24 recite that, in response to receiving a file system statement, a transaction is started by acquiring either a read lock or a write lock on a corresponding row of a data table. As described in the previous section, in Narang, the application must first acquire DBMS permission to access a picture file prior to issuing a file system statement to open the picture file. Additionally, as noted by the Office Action (Pg. 6), Nojima fails to teach starting the transaction by acquiring either a read lock or a write lock on a corresponding row of a data table. Accordingly, the cited references cannot possibly teach or suggest acquiring either a read lock or a write lock "in response to receiving the file system statement," as required by independent claims 1 and 24. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 24 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants further submit that claims 12, 13 and 35 are patentable at least be reason of their dependency.

Claims 2 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Nojima in view of Narang and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,035,874 ("Reed"). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that these claims are patentable at least be reason of their dependency.

Claims 3-5, 7-11, 26-28 and 30-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Nojima in view of Narang and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,870,758 ("Bramford"). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that these claims are patentable at least be reason of their dependency.

Claims 6 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Nojima in view of Narang and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,626 ("Ponnekanti"). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that these claims are patentable at least be reason of their dependency.

Claims 15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Narang in view of Reed. Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that these claims are patentable at least be reason of their dependency.

Claims 16 and 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being as allegedly being unpatentable over Narang in view of Bramford. Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that these claims are patentable at least be reason of their dependency.

**DOCKET NO.:** 306986.01 / MSFT-2924  
**Application No.:** 10/797,238  
**Office Action Dated:** September 15, 2006

**PATENT**

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections are respectfully requested.

**DOCKET NO.:** 306986.01 / MSFT-2924  
**Application No.:** 10/797,238  
**Office Action Dated:** September 15, 2006

**PATENT**

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: December 15, 2006

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman  
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
2929 Arch Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439